

*Solano Transportation Authority*

**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (RTIF)  
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP MEETING AGENDA**

**Thursday, October 15, 2009  
STA Main Conference Room  
One Harbor Center, Suite 130  
Suisun City, CA 94585**

---

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>ACTIVITY</u></b>	<b><u>ADMINISTRATOR</u></b>
<b>I.</b>	<b>CALL TO ORDER—SELF INTRODUCTIONS</b>	Sam Shelton, STA
<b>II.</b>	<b>APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA</b>	
<b>III.</b>	<b>APPROVAL OF THE AUGUST 19, 2009 MEETING</b>	
<b>IV.</b>	<b>INFORMATION ITEMS</b>	
<b>A.</b>	RTIF Nexus Study Development Schedule	Sam Shelton, STA
<b>B.</b>	Model Update Progress	Robert Macaulay, STA
<b>C.</b>	Revised Project Selection Criteria	Sam Shelton, STA
<b>D.</b>	Program Implementation Options	Jason Moody, EPS
<b>V.</b>	<b>ADJOURNMENT</b>	
	The next RTIF Technical Working Group meeting is scheduled for December 10, 2009.	

---

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



**REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION IMPACT FEE (RTIF)  
TECHNICAL WORKING GROUP  
Minutes for the meeting of  
August 19, 2009**

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

The RTIF Technical Working Group was called to order at approximately 1:30 p.m. in the Solano Transportation Authority's Main Conference Room.

**Present:**

<b>Working Group Members Present:</b>	Mike Roberts	City of Benicia
	Royce Cunningham	City of Dixon
	Erin Beavers	City of Fairfield
	Wayne Lewis	City of Fairfield
	Dan Kasperson	City of Suisun City
	Jeff Knowles	City of Vacaville
	Gary Leach	City of Vallejo
	Paul Wiese	County of Solano

<b>STA Staff Present:</b>	Robert Macaulay	STA
	Robert Guerrero	STA
	Sam Shelton	STA
	Karen Koelling	STA
	Jason Moody	Economic Planning Systems
	Marc Feldman	Fehr & Peers

**II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

On a motion from Royce Cunningham, and a second from Mike Roberts, the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the agenda.

**III. APPROVAL OF APRIL 1, 2009 AND JULY 22, 2009 MEETING MINUTES**

With a motion by Dan Kasperson to amend the date of the April meeting to read April 1, 2009. On a motion by Royce Cunningham and a second by Wayne Lewis the STA RTIF Technical Working Group unanimously approved the meeting minutes.

#### **IV. INFORMATION ITEMS**

##### **A. Local Transportation Impact Fee Coordination**

Sam Shelton reviewed information collected on local transportation impact fee projects and the progress local agencies are making on their local fee program updates.

Royce Cunningham stated that this is good information to have as the STA develops the RTIF. Mr. Cunningham noted further that he would like to see what happens with the RTIF process, then update Dixon's local TIF.

Paul Wiese asked that as the members of the RTIF Stakeholders Committee are appointed, STA staff should copy the Technical Working Group on these communications. Sam Shelton stated that he would make sure that STA staff copies the Technical Working Group on future correspondence to the Stakeholders Committee.

##### **B. STA Model Update Status**

Robert Macaulay reviewed the STA's progress on updating the model to meet the needs of the RTIF Nexus Study development process.

##### **C. Nexus Study Delivery Schedule**

Sam Shelton reviewed the revised delivery schedule with the technical working group. Jason Moody advised the group that we should consider implementation options in concert with the project selection criteria for the next meeting. Sam Shelton stated that he would add these items to each committee's preliminary agendas.

##### **D. Project Selection Criteria**

Jason Moody reviewed the project selection criteria with the technical working group.

Wayne Lewis stated that the STA travel demand model will be required to establish a nexus. Jason Moody reviewed the steps required under AB 1600 to establish a nexus for an impact fee, such as creating a ratio of burden between existing and new growth. Mr. Moody further stated that the travel demand model is currently robust enough to withstand a legal challenge; however, noted that accuracy improvements would be needed to better allocate costs and fees between agencies.

Mike Roberts asked if we use the STA's CTP Routes of Regional Significance, which lists arterials, can the model create a nexus if it is not accurate enough to model arterials. Jeff Knowles stated that fees will always be a small percentage of a total nexus study's findings making the nexus less critical. Mr. Knowles continued by stating that the issue will be the fairness of who pays for the costs of the project, which is tied to the accuracy of the model. Mr. Knowles stated that it is too soon to have this discussion until the model is updated.

Jason Moody agreed with Jeff Knowles, stating that increasing the model accuracy will help clarify equity issues and project selection issues.

Jason Moody stated that the model is one tool that will help us select projects for the RTIF. Mr. Moody stated that the stakeholders and policy committee members will discuss other non-model related criteria that will help prioritize projects for fee funding later on.

Erin Beavers asked if exiting deficiencies should be taken into account and if they could even be included in a nexus study tied to new development impacts. Jason Moody answered that new development can pay for their share of the impacts to road rehabilitation and safety improvements, but not for all of the improvements.

Royce Cunningham stated that he would support a criteria that created a threshold for regional traffic, prior to a project being selected for the RTIF. Mr. Cunningham continued by noting that the fee calculations could be based on the percentage of regional trips against the total cost of the project. Jeff Knowles noted that to conduct that analysis, one would need the model to be accurate for regional trips to produce that ratio.

**E. Model Validation Standards for RTIF Criteria Measurements**

Marc Feldman with Fehr and Peers noted that the current STA model could predict regional trips along grouped arterials (screenlines) between cities, but not yet along specific arterials. Mr. Knowles asked that the modeling requirements discussion be brought to the STA's Model Technical Advisory Committee.

**III. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. The next meeting of the STA RTIF Working Group meeting will be scheduled for.

# Solano Transportation Authority

## Regional Transportation Impact Fee (RTIF), Summary of Meetings and Discussion Items

DRAFT, 09-15-09

Technical Working Group (2 <sup>nd</sup> Thurs)			Stakeholder Committee (4 <sup>th</sup> Thurs)		Policy Committee (2 <sup>nd</sup> Weds)	
2009	Date	Items	Date	Items	Date	Items
<b>April</b>	04-01-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intro to EPS</li> <li>• Draft Timeline</li> <li>• Modeling Update</li> <li>• Local Impact Fee Projects</li> </ul>			04-08-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board Approves RTIF Outreach</li> </ul>
<b>May</b>					05-04-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intro to EPS</li> <li>• Draft Timeline</li> <li>• Recommend Governance Model to STA Board</li> <li>• Adopts Stakeholder committee</li> </ul>
<b>June</b>						
<b>July</b>	07-22-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review Capital Project Criteria</li> <li>• Modeling Update</li> </ul>				
<b>Aug</b>	08-19-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review revised Capital Project Criteria</li> <li>• Modeling Update</li> </ul>				
<b>Sept</b>			09-17-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intro to EPS, Draft Timeline</li> <li>• Collect Concerns</li> </ul>		
<b>Oct</b>	10-08-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review revised Capital Project Criteria</li> <li>• Modeling Update</li> <li>• Review Program Implementation Options</li> </ul>	10-22-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review revised Capital Project Criteria</li> <li>• Review Program Implementation Options</li> </ul>		
<b>Nov</b>					11-13-09 or late Oct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review revised Capital Project Criteria</li> <li>• Review Program Implementation Options</li> </ul>
<b>Dec</b>	12-10-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend Capital Project Criteria</u></li> <li>• <u>Recommend Program Implementation Options</u></li> <li>• Review draft RTIF Project List &amp; Costs based on criteria</li> </ul>	12-17-09	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend Capital Project Criteria</u></li> <li>• <u>Recommend Program Implementation Options</u></li> <li>• Review draft RTIF Project List &amp; Costs based on criteria</li> </ul>		

	Technical Working Group (2 <sup>nd</sup> Thurs)		Stakeholder Committee (4 <sup>th</sup> Thurs)		Policy Committee (2 <sup>nd</sup> Weds)	
2010	Date	Items	Date	Items	Date	Items
Jan					01-13-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend Capital Project Criteria</u></li> <li>• <u>Recommend Program Implementation Options</u></li> <li>• <u>Review draft RTIF Project List &amp; Costs based on criteria</u></li> </ul>
Feb	02-11-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend RTIF Project List &amp; Costs</u></li> <li>• <u>Review Cost Allocation Method</u></li> <li>• <u>Review preliminary Fee schedule</u></li> </ul>	02-25-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend RTIF Project List &amp; Costs</u></li> <li>• <u>Review Cost Allocation Method</u></li> <li>• <u>Review preliminary Fee schedule</u></li> </ul>	03-10-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend RTIF Project List &amp; Costs</u></li> <li>• <u>Review Cost Allocation Method</u></li> <li>• <u>Review preliminary Fee schedule</u></li> </ul>
Mar						
Apr	04-08-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend Cost Allocation Method</u></li> <li>• <u>Recommend preliminary Fee schedule</u></li> </ul>	04-22-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend Cost Allocation Method</u></li> <li>• <u>Recommend preliminary Fee schedule</u></li> </ul>	05-12-10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Recommend Cost Allocation Method</u></li> <li>• <u>Recommend preliminary Fee schedule</u></li> </ul>
May						
June	06-10-10	• <u>Review Draft Nexus Study Report</u>	06-10-10	• <u>Review Draft Nexus Study Report</u>		
July					07-14-10	• <u>Review Draft Nexus Study Report</u>
Aug	08-12-10	• <u>Recommend Draft Nexus Study Report</u>	08-26-10	• <u>Recommend Draft Nexus Study Report</u>	09-08-10	• <u>Recommend Draft Nexus Study Report</u>
Sept						
Oct	10-14-10	• <u>Assist with RTIF Implementation</u>	10-21-10	• <u>Assist with RTIF Implementation</u>	10-13-10	• <u>Assist with RTIF Implementation</u>

Potential RTPF Project Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup>

Screening Criteria <sup>2</sup>	Advantages	Disadvantages	STA Travel Demand Model Role
<b>Absolute Criteria</b> Included in the CTP, RORS, FORS, or defined RTPF network	Only include projects in Comp. Trans. Plan, FORTS, or Transit Facilities of Regional Transportation Planning Councils	May reduce flexibility to fund desired projects	Not needed
Included in local the program	Eliminate projects already included in local program	Reduces opportunities for regional shared funding	Not needed
Policy/Outstanding "Red Flag"	Only include projects selected / approved by Policy Committee	May not reflect objectives, specified criteria	Not needed
Not existing facilities	Eliminate projects that address existing deficiencies	May reduce flexibility to fund desired projects	Actual traffic counts are better for measuring existing deficiencies
Not address existing deficiencies	Projects must address existing deficiencies and future needs	May reduce flexibility to fund desired projects	Actual traffic counts are better for measuring existing deficiencies
Exclude State / Federal Facilities	Exclude projects located on State or Federally maintained facilities	Eliminates projects important to regional mobility. Program cannot be used as partial mitigation for impacts on urban facilities.	Not needed
Located in urbanized area	Only include projects at least partially located in urbanized area	May reduce flexibility to fund desired projects	Not needed
<b>Relative or Absolute Criteria</b> Regional significance	Focus on projects that serve a significant number of regional trips (e.g., 20% regional trips)	Positive technical / modeling accuracy regarding origin-destination patterns	Can be used but should be cautious - more reliable if one looks at project as part of a screening
Regional equity	Focus on enhancing regional equity (e.g., roughly equal proportion of project costs by population of the district)	May produce projects with higher utilization	Can be used to predict roughly what % of a given project is used by traffic originating in the different cities within Sonoma County
Existing / prioritized facilities	Select projects that exceed a stated traffic threshold (such as LOS, Vehicle hours of delay, AADT, Volume to capacity ratio, etc.)	Requires technical / modeling accuracy on existing traffic volume and existing facilities	If existing traffic levels are used, then actual traffic counts would be needed to validate the model with current or forecasting traffic levels.
Competition / New facilities	Only include projects expected to be initiated within defined time frame	May not capture complete set of projects needed to accommodate future growth	Not needed
Reduces in VMT	Prioritize projects that reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled	Addresses State / Federal GHG policies	Can be used to determine relative VMT.


(1) Can be either absolute or relative criteria. (2) Can be used to predict roughly what % of a given project is used by traffic originating in the different cities within Sonoma County. (3) Can be used to predict roughly what % of a given project is used by traffic originating in the different cities within Sonoma County.

Benicia	Dixon	Fairfield	Suisun	Rio Vista	Vacaville	Vallejo	Sonoma County
Yes	Yes but not include Parkway Blvd	No response	Yes	No response	No	No response	Yes
No	No, State Road 113	No response	No	No	No, State Road 113	No	No
No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Yes, do not need to go to successful facility	No, SR 113	No	No	No	Yes, but not County Road 113	No	Yes, but not County Road 113
No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, for every 1 mile of project	Yes, for every 1 mile of project	Yes, for every 1 mile of project	Yes, for every 1 mile of project	Yes, for every 1 mile of project
Yes	Yes, explore use of both local and regional roads	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, but not County Road 113
No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Yes	Yes, State Road 113	No	Yes, but not County Road 113	No	No	No	No



## **MEMORANDUM**

To: Sam Shelton, STA  
From: Jason Moody and Eileen Tumulad  
Subject: Solano County RTIF: Implementation Options; EPS #19016  
Date: October 2, 2009



The Solano County Regional Traffic Impact Fee (RTIF) would provide funding for transportation improvements that serve the regional and collective needs of participating jurisdictions. Given that the revenues would be generated by and allocated to multiple jurisdictions, decisions will need to be made as to how the program would be administered and how funding would be shared and prioritized. This memorandum discusses various organizational mechanisms for implementing this process. The primary options are also summarized in **Table 1**.

It should be noted that the RTIF Policy Committee has already recommended that the Solano Transportation Improvement Authority (STIA) administer the RTIF program. The STIA is a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) created by the Solano County Board of Supervisors in 2004 to develop a Solano County Transportation Expenditure Plan and administer a transportation sales tax. Although the sales tax measure was not approved by the required two-thirds majority vote, the STIA remains in place. The STIA board of Directors is made up of representatives appointed by elected officials from all the County jurisdictions.

In its role as administrator of the RTIF program, the STIA will have a number of baseline responsibilities that may expand depending upon the choice of implementation mechanisms selected and described herein. At a minimum, the STIA will be responsible for maintaining and updating the RTIF model, calculating the applicable fee(s), approving the list of eligible RTIF projects, and promulgating/monitoring the RTIF implementation process. More expanded responsibilities could include the prioritization and allocation of RTIF expenditures.

## Fee Collection and Distribution

While the STIA will serve as the RTIF administrative entity, there exist a variety of options to allocate fee revenues among various jurisdictions. This analysis has identified three "prototype" models that range from minimal to more centralized control. Of course, a range of permutations exists within this spectrum depending on the specific organization requirements and goals of the entities involved. The prototype models are:

- 1. Decentralized control:** Each jurisdiction can collect and bank the RTIF revenue generated within their boundaries. The resulting funds can then be applied to a "pick list" of eligible transportation projects approved as part of the RTIF process. This approach will provide maximum flexibility to participating jurisdictions in the prioritization and application of RTIF funds. This "return to source" approach can minimize the need for inter-jurisdictional negotiations regarding the prioritization of investments. Of course, some coordination will still be required for improvements that span jurisdictional boundaries.
- 2. Centralized control:** Under this approach the STIA would both administer the RTIF program and be responsible for applying the funds to established RTIF projects. In other words, RTIF revenue collected by each jurisdiction would be transferred directly to the STIA. Funding decisions would be based on input from the STIA Board and would require a multi-jurisdictional agreement on the prioritization and application of RTIF funds. This approach builds in the need for multi-jurisdictional planning and coordination, which requires jurisdictions to utilize a network approach to transportation planning and recognizes the holistic nature of transportation systems.

The operating agreement for the East Contra Costa Regional Fee and Financing Authority (the Authority) is an example of the "centralized control" prototype. Revenues collected from each jurisdiction are forwarded to the Authority for the funding of transportation projects.

- 3. Joint control:** This approach represents a hybrid of the centralized and decentralized models above by allowing for a percentage of the funds collected by each jurisdiction (e.g., 50 percent) to remain and be controlled by that jurisdiction. The remaining revenue would be forwarded to the STIA for administration and application of RTIF funds for eligible projects. This alternative allows for the ability of each jurisdiction to prioritize and apply a portion of RTIF funds, while facilitating the funding of multi-jurisdictional projects. It strikes a balance between a complete "return-to-source" approach and more centralized control.

The operating agreement for the San Joaquin Council of Governments (SJCOG) is an example of the "joint control" prototype, where a portion of fee revenues collected by each jurisdiction is paid to SJCOG for funding regional transportation improvement projects. Each participating jurisdiction retains the remainder of the fee revenue and can prioritize and apply funds to selected transportation projects.

## Fee District Options

A Fee district is the geographical area that contains the inter-community travel patterns that provide the basis for evaluating trip distribution and transportation needs. A fee district can be the entire County or separate geographical sub-areas within the County with distinct transportation patterns and needs. Generally speaking separate fee levels are calculated for each fee district. In other words, if the entire County is treated as a single fee district than there

would be one regional fee level applied to all participating jurisdictions (of course, individual jurisdictions are free to develop their own local fees).

In contrast to a single countywide fee district, the RTIF could also be calculated and applied to multiple fee districts in the County. This approach would account for sub-regional differences in growth, transportation needs, trip patterns, and corresponding RTIF contributions. The benefit of multiple fee districts is that it allows for a more precise "nexus" between the fee level of a particular district and the RTIF program investments that serve it. A disadvantage is that multiple districts may run counter to the regional nature of the RTIF program. In addition, multiple fee districts generally require more complex, precise and reliable transportation modeling capabilities and results.

It is also possible to create separate fee "sub-districts" that serve as hybrid between the single and multiple fee district approaches. The sub-district approach maintains a single Countywide fee but allows for separate fee layers for a particular set of improvements to be unique to particular geographic areas. For example, a Vallejo-Benicia "sub-district" could include a special "transit fee" on new development in this area to cover a portion of the costs of transit projects that serve these jurisdictions. Ultimately, the RTIF could consist of variety of "sub-district" fees along with one countywide fee.

## **Implications and Next Steps**

The implementation options described above span the spectrum from a more centralized and integrated system to a more decentralized and heterogeneous one. The former would involve a single fee with the transportation investment decisions funneled through the STIA, a multi-jurisdictional agency. The latter would involve multiple fee districts with individual jurisdictions collecting and distributing fee revenue. Within this spectrum, multiple permutations are possible. The selection of the most appropriate set of implementation mechanisms will depend on the goals of participating jurisdictions. In other words, form should follow function when designing appropriate programmatic approaches.

It is expected that the development and refinement of the appropriate RTIF implementation process will occur concurrently with the development of other program elements, including the modeling process and project selection criteria. The STA intends to incorporate input from the Policy, Steering, and Stakeholder Committees as well as the project consultants to formulate the most effective and palatable approach.

**Table 1**  
**RTIF Implementation Matrix**

Implementation Category	Description	Advantages	Disadvantages
<b>Revenue Collection and Distribution Options</b>			
Decentralized Control	Each jurisdiction collects and keeps the RTIF revenue generated within its boundaries and applies the funds to eligible RTIF projects of their choice.	Provides maximum flexibility to participating jurisdictions in the prioritization of RTIF funds. Can also minimize the need for inter-jurisdictional negotiations for prioritization.	Requires inter-jurisdictional coordination for funding multi-jurisdictional projects.
Centralized Control	RTIF revenue collected by each jurisdiction and forwarded to STIA for prioritization and expenditure on approved RTIF projects.	Builds in the need for multi-jurisdictional planning and coordination using an established multi-jurisdictional JPA.	Jurisdictions relinquish direct local control of RTIF revenues and ability to prioritize "their" projects.
Joint Control	A "hybrid" approach which allows jurisdictions to retain a percentage of the funds collected and forward the rest to the STIA.	Provides a "happy medium" between complete local versus complete centralized control.	Depending on the "return-to-source" percentages, may still have issues with coordination of investments or loss of local buy-in.
<b>Fee District Options</b>			
Single County-Wide Fee	One fee is calculated for the entire County	Simplifies the fee modeling requirements and reinforces the regional nature of the RTIF program.	Less precise accounting of sub-regional differences in transportation needs and impacts
Multiple Fee Districts	Separate fee levels for defined sub-areas in the County based on unique trip distribution.	Accounts for sub-regional differences in growth, transportation needs, trip patterns, and corresponding RTIF program fee contributions.	Counter to the regional intent of RTIF program. Requires more complex modeling and administration process.
Fee Sub-Districts	Allow for special fee layers to be included on top of single RTIF fee with unique "sub-districts" to fund desired projects that only benefit the fee sub-district (e.g., HOV lanes, transit, etc.)	Allows for specific areas in the region to provide increased funding for specific priority projects without sacrificing the regional nature of the RTIF program.	May require more complex modeling and administration and with multiple "special districts" with separate priority projects.

## Input on Potential RTIF Project Screening Criteria<sup>1</sup>

Screening Criteria <sup>2</sup>	Support	Do Not Support	No comment
<b><u>Absolute Criteria</u></b>			
Included in the CTP, RORS, TFORS, or defined RTIF network	Benicia, Suisun City, Solano County, Dixon	None	Fairfield, Rio Vista, Vacaville, Vallejo
Exclude projects in local fee program(s)	None	Benicia, Dixon, Vacaville	Fairfield, Suisun, Rio Vista, Vallejo, Solano County
Policy Committee "Pick-list"	None	Benicia	Dixon, Fairfield, Suisun, Rio Vista, Vallejo, Vacaville, Solano County
No existing deficiencies	None	Benicia, Vacaville	Dixon, Fairfield, Suisun, Rio Vista, Vallejo, Solano County
Must address existing deficiencies	Vacaville	Benicia	Dixon, Fairfield, Suisun, Rio Vista, Vallejo, Solano County
Exclude State / Federal Facilities	Benicia	Dixon	Vacaville, Fairfield, Suisun, Rio Vista, Vallejo, Solano County
Located in unincorporated area	None	Benicia, Suisun	Vacaville, Fairfield, Dixon, Rio Vista, Vallejo, Solano
<b><u>Relative or Absolute Criteria</u></b>			
Regional significance	Benicia, Suisun, Vacaville, Solano County		Fairfield, Dixon, Rio Vista, Vallejo,
Regional equity	Benicia, Suisun, Vacaville, Solano County, Dixon	None	Fairfield, Rio Vista, Vallejo
Existing / projected traffic characteristics	Benicia, Suisun, Solano County, Dixon	None	Fairfield, Vacaville, Rio Vista, Vallejo
Constrained time horizon	None	Benicia	Dixon, Fairfield, Suisun, Rio Vista, Vallejo, Vacaville, Solano County
Reduction in VMT	Benicia, Suisun	Dixon, Vacaville	Fairfield, Dixon, Rio Vista, Vallejo, Solano County, Suisun

(1) List is neither exhaustive or mutually exclusive. It is possible that a hybrid of these options, or others not considered here, can serve as the basis for the final fee.

(2) Screening criteria assumes all projects comply with AB 1600 and are not already fully funded by another

